G. R. S. 59] GPB—15,000—22-7-14

GENERAL AND REVENUE SECRETARIAT.

1903
~~191~~ . P31
(municipal)

File No. 135 of 1903

Serial Nos. 1—1

B
~~**Papers Filed.**~~

Month February 1904

SUBJECT.

Reinstatement of B K. Jamkhandi, late Conservancy Overseer of the Bangalore City

Indexed. T. Subbarao

PREVIOUS REFERENCES. LATER REFERENCES.

Commissioner's
V. R.

The Chief Rev and Genl Secretariat

Office of the Dewan of Mysore.

File No. (if any)

Directions.

No., date and purport of receipts to be entered in red, and office note in black ink in order of dates.—To be written only on one side, and inside the line of margin.

Office Note.

51-02

Branch Legal Board

Subject. Appeal preferred by B.K Thirthappa Lake Conservancy Overseer of the Bangalore City, against the order of the Resident, dispensing with his services

In para 5 of Proc No 1727-92 dated 11.02 of the 6th June 1902, the Government ordered as follows:

"x x It is observed that in addition to the Sanitary Inspector and his Assistant, there are at present 9 Overseers on different grades of pay for the seven Divisions of the City, and the reasons for the proposed retention of the two Probationary Overseers in spite of the recommendations of the Sub-Committee, and the Board is not clear. Government are not therefore prepared to sanction the precipitate retirement of the old Overseers, whose services have ordered to be done away with, or any

other change which may involve extra expenditure to the Municipality."

2. The petitioner Jivukaffa was one of the Conservancy Overseers whose services were dispensed with in giving effect to the above order.

3. The Health Officer in his Notice of the 2nd July 1903 stated that the petitioner's services would not be required from the 1st August 1903, as Govt had ordered that the services of two Supernumary Overseers might be dispensed with, but in his Exhibit in reply to Kunhappai petitioner praying for being retained in service and for the withdrawal of the Notice, he was informed that as Govt had directed the abolition of two Conservancy Overseers, the President sees no reason to withdraw the Notice already served on him.

4. Against the above order the petitioner appeals to Govt and states as follows.

i. That he was employed in the Municipality on the 25th July 1898 by Mr J. J. Leonard.

(ii) That the ~~President~~ (Council) Vice-President (Health Officer) compelled the petitioner in 1900 to submit proposals for the Increase & Lake Improvement and the proposals

3

accordingly
submitted & by him there were appointments
of

(iii) That the appointment of Overseer held by him was permanent and not temporary or probationary.

(iv) That at no time within five years of the petitioners service has there arisen any question as to the nature of his appointment nor has he been informed that its tenor was only temporary

(v) That subsequent to petitioners entering into service there were a number of vacancies of Rs 15 and upwards & that his claims for confirmation should have first been Taken into Consideration in filling them up, if it was a fact that petitioners services were only temporary as now Stated. That

(vi) the petitioner too did not represent his claims at the time of these vacancies as he was fully assured of the permanent nature of his appointments

(vii) That persons entertained long after the petitioner joined the Service except to

6 -th to have been removed instead of he

VII That at present there are one or two vacancies of Conservancy Overseers Viz: appointments held by Abdulla Khan and Zynullabuddin (the former having died and the latter having been dismissed) that the petitioner might have been retained — the above vacancies not having been being allowed to be filled up

VIII That besides the above appointments the following are also vacant

1. Market Sergeant
2. Distraining Officer
3. Lighting Inspectors

Under the above circumstances the petitioner prays that he may be restored to his appointment

5 Submitted for orders as to whether the Petition may be forwarded to the President for perusal, with Petitioner's service on the several allegations 26-8-05. Register of other records connected with his appointment

To the Dewan, through the 2nd Councillor.

Dt. 28/8/03

/1265/

Acting Interpreter

5

6 The President's report having been called for state that on C.P. No 11977-D dated the 22nd March 1897 Lt 276-96 Government sanctioned the entertainment of two Probationary Conservancy Overseers that the petitioner was one of the two hands employed at the time that the two hands were kept on till June 1903 when the petitioner's services had to be dispensed with on receipt of the Govt order directing the municipality to do away with the services of the said Overseers as recommended by the Board.

B

para 5 of re 17287-92 Lt 4-03 .6.03 Hqrs

7 With reference to the petitioner's allegation that he was not one of the Probationary Overseers the President state that the petitioner has not produced any order given him appointing him as a permanent Overseer nor is there any record in the Municipal Office to that

effect, and that there is no service Requisites of the petitioner available wherein his first entertainment in the municipality and the nature and designation of employment are entered and attested by any officer of the municipality either at the time he was taken to service or at any subsequent occasion He further says that the petitioner ought not to have been allowed to answer his life but that it was done with the view that there was necessity for the Continuance of the two posts of Probationers Overseers and sanction for their re Corporation into the permanent establishment should be obtained, that there are no pinions to the petitioner in the Conservancy establishment. He also makes reference about the petitioner's past Conduct, and states that he is said to be indifferent, unreliable as a public servant and ignorant of his work and that he is stated to have been punished several

dismissed for misconduct.

Submitted for orders.

On J 27-10-03

I There are no definite charges against the Petitioner for misconduct the very fact that her services were dispensed with owing to the abolition of the Probationary Inspectors places supports this presumption - As will be seen from Govt. Pro × No. 11917-18 L7. 276-96 dated 22nd March 1898, the appointment of Probationary Inspectors was not temporary and the Petitioner should have been given a permanent place when there were vacancies in the Department, as suggested by the former President in his letter of 16th March 1898. × This mark the fact that this was not done is no fault of the Petitioner, who was apparently under the impression that she held a permanent appointment for over 5 years & who was also allowed to assume her life. Under such circumstances

Flag B of the link Pra no 276.

× Flag C.

it seems hard that the Petitioner should be deprived of his means of subsistance after 5 years service in the Municipality. The Lieut Provincial may therefore if approved be asked to confer on the Petitioner one of the existing vacancies or if there are no vacancies to provide him with an appointment as soon as a vacancy occurs.

Clad for orders

JHB
28/10/03

JH
30/10/3

The Decision through the Councillor

The Petitioner need prominent post - The President considers him "indifferent" unsuitable as a Public Servant and regardless of his many "Caddo that" he has not been promoted because for our Constant would prefer the Arabs -

JH

Here is a letter to the Petitioner to have it explained that he is not entitled to such a thing as a pension but that he will be given the first vacancy that occurs in the Police Force

J8
11.03

Rupees 7-8-0 a month— On the petitioner's representation for a better appointment on the salary he had been originally getting the Presidency has endorsed him that as he could not be granted with a responsible post he had to be given a lower post on Rs 50 pay (vide enclosure to the present petition)

The petitioner prays that 18th grant'd

Vs Thirukabha has again appealed to Government against the above order and prays that in case he cannot be granted to hold the place of a Conservancy Overseer some other appointment carrying equal salary may be ordered to be given him as there are two or three vacancies in the Municipality

Submitted for orders

D.V.J 3/2/04 As already stated in para 8 supra Tirukappa had insured his life which is however Mentioned in Roj-8-. Cannot do

[illegible]

5/2/04.

L 38

SECTION: Miscl.

FILE No. 1252 of 03 1903-04

SER: A. No. 6787

Name of Petitioner R. K. Thirlapp
Son of Kempanna

Village Hallaperpet

Taluk Bangalore city

District

Date of Arzi 15-5-03.

Date of Receipt 17/5

Date of Disposal

No. of Enclosure Four

I, the undersigned, have the honour to be, Sir, your most obedient servant,

R. K. Thirlapp

Transferred to the Local & Municipal Branch

Draw
5/11

K. V. N
dy 21/10/03

Note perused
28.8.03

ABSTRACT

The petitioner complains that he was a permanent servant of the Municipality as Conservancy overseer, had also misconduct he was without any reason whatsoever, informed by the Vice President in his order No. 14 dy 2-7-03 that the pet services would not be required by the Municipality from 15th of July 03 as the Govt have since directed

two of the probationary
~~should be discharged~~
foresters concerned with it
that when he represented that
he was not a probationary overseer
but that he was a conservancy
overseer holding permanent
employment, he was appointed
(Ex. 141 dy 20-9-03) that
it was no reason to withdraw
from order, as the Govt
avoided the abolition
two Conservancy overseers

He states that it is
unjust and against the
standing rules, to treat him
away from his permanent
employment and without
cause, and prays that
he may be restored to
his former employment

12/8/03

SECTION Mysl

FILE No. 13 of 1903 From

SERIAL No. 2 THE SECY. TO THE GOVT OF MYSORE
REV. & REV. DEPTS.

To

The President
City Municipal Board
Bangalore

Dated 7/9/03
Despatched
Received
General No. 1125
Ld. No. 57-02

Enclosure No. As per list sent
in 2 and 6

11.9.03
31.8.03

Dated 1.1X.03

I am forwarding herewith petition Regd No 415 of the 15th Instant August 1903 received in this office from B. K. Thirkappa late Conservancy Overseer Bangalore city together with its Enclosures have the honour to request the President will be good enough to submit a detailed report on the allegations made in para 8 thereof, with the Service Registers of Thirkappa and the original order of July 1898 appointing him as

in the Municipality and also
to state how if ~~he~~ as now alleged he was a
Probationary Overseer, he
was allowed by the President
to ~~insure his life~~ submit
his proposals for life insurance
& why his services were not
dispensed with before he
could complete his 5 years
service in the Municipality
instead of giving him time upto 18th August 1903
to complete that Service, upto
~~18th August 1903~~.

Bon. Mec.

Lee 3/9/03

WB
28/8/03

SECTION Judicial

FILE No. 135 of 1903

SERIAL No. 3



3 & L 810

4

Municipal Commission,
Bangalore City.

To
The Secretary to the Government of
His Highness the Maharaja of Mysore,
Genl. & Rev. Departments,
Bangalore.

Dated 13
Despatched 14-
Received 3 October 1903

General No. 94
No.

Enclosures No. 3.

Submitting a detailed report on the petition from Vinakappa, late Probationary Conservancy Overseer, Bangalore City Municipality, as called for in the Secretary's docket No: 825/1751-02 dated the 7th ultimo

14

A.S.M.
Asst. Comm. 27/10

4

OFFICE OF THE MUNICIPAL COMMISSION,

City Bangalore, October 13 1903
14,

No. 94
Encls: 3.

FROM

THE PRESIDENT,
Municipal Commission,
Bangalore City.

To

The Secretary to the Government
of His Highness the Maharaja of Mysore,
General & Revenue Departments,
Bangalore.

SIR

With reference to your docket No. 1125/1751-02 dated the 7th ultimo, forwarding for report an appeal petition from one Thirakappa, formerly a Probationary Conservancy Overseer in this Municipality complaining against the President's Order for his Services, as such being dispensed with, I have the honour to state that the entertainment of two Probationary Conservancy Overseers was sanctioned by Government in Proceedings No. 11917-8 of 1897 vide Municipal Act 4. 27-91

dated the 22nd March 1898 and the petitioner was one of the two hands who were employed accordingly on that occasion. These hands were kept on as the continuance of their services was felt necessary owing to the appearance of plague in the city every year since their employment and consequent need for greater supervision of the conservancy staff.

But the Board while submitting the Budget Estimates for 1902-1903 recommended to Government with a view to effect curtailment of expenditure in the Municipality as far as possible the abolition among other reductions of the two Probationary Overseer's posts also. The Government accordingly sanctioned

the reduction But, as the abolition of those two places had been proposed by the Board without reference to the Health Department, a reconsideration of the order of reduction was requested, but Government were not pleased to do so and final orders insisting on the dispensing with the services of those two hands were passed in Proceedings No. 17287-92 / 17.11-1902 dated the 6th June 1903. Thereupon the services of Thirakappa had to be dispensed with

In para 8 of his appeal petition, Thirakappa has alleged that he was not a Probationery but a permanent Overseer and that at the time of his

employment the then President informed him that he was permanently employed.

The petitioner has not produced any order given him appointing him as a permanent Overseer. There is now record also in this office to that effect. He ought not to have been allowed to insure his life, but it was done with the view that there was necessity for the continuance of the two posts of Probationary Overseers and sanction of Government for their incorporation into the permanent establishment should be obtained.

There is no Service Register of the

petitioner available wherein his first entertainment in the Municipality and the nature and designation of employment are entered and attested by any officer of the Municipality either at the time he was taken to service or at any subsequent occasion.

No written order regarding the petitioner's first employment is also forthcoming in the office and the statement made in column (c) of para 8 in the petition, and the petitioner's failure to produce the order, if any, issued to him informing him of his entertainment shows that no written orders were passed at the time in the matter.

There are no rumors to the petitioner

in Service in the Conservancy Establishment and other allegations made by him in the petition are untrue.

Further, it has to be stated that he has been reported to have been often found fault with for bad work and is said to be indifferent unreliable, as a public servant and ignorant of his work. He is stated to have been also punished several times for misconduct.

2. The petition received with the docket under reply is herewith returned

I have the honor to be
Sir,
Your most obedient servant
[signature]
President

mbk

12

Mysore Government
General and Revenue Secretariat
Public Department
Reg'd No
Date

H.V. Nanjundayya Esq

Secretary to Government of Mysore,

Bangalore.

Ex-Bfl 3

Respected Sir,

2 Enclosures

The humble petition of B.K. Tirakappa, Conservancy Overseer, of the City Municipality, Sheweth:-

415

1. That the humble petitioner is the Conservancy Overseer of the City Municipality.

2. That he entered service as such, on the 25th July 1898, under the orders of the then President, Mr. T.T. Leonard, and has since been continuing in the Municipal service.

3. That under the orders of the present Vice President, the petitioner also insured his life, in the year 1900, the Government having directed the insurance of all permanent employees of the Municipality.

4. That during the five years that the humble petitioner has been in service, he has been discharging his duties zealously and honestly, without giving room for any sort of complaint or dissatisfaction.

5. That while the petitioner was a permanent servant of the Municipality and had also insured his life, he was, without any reason whatsoever, informed by the Vice-President in order No.14 dated 2nd July 1903, that the petitioner's service would not be required in the Municipality, from the 1st August 1903, as the Government had since directed that two of the probationery Overseers should be dispensed with. Copy of this endorsement is submitted.

6. That, against this order, the humble petitioner represented that he was a permanent employee and not a probationer, that he was all along been treated as such, that he had insured his life, that several vacancies created after he

he joined the service had been otherwise filled up and that it was hard, after so many years of approved service to be suddenly called upon to quit the service.

7. That in reply to the said representation, the petitioner has received an endorsement No.141 dated 31st July, of which a copy is submitted, to the effect that as the Government have directed the abolition of two Conservancy (as against Probationery mentioned in the first order) Overseers, the President sees no reason to withdraw the notice already served upon petitioner.

8. That against this order, the humble petitioner now begs to approach the Government, with these few lines, the petitioner's case will receive consideration. In so doing, the humble petitioner begs to submit the following:-

(a) That there is nothing to show that the humble petitioner was a Probationery Overseer as originally mentioned in the notice first served upon him.

(b) That the fact that the petitioner was compelled to insure his life, under the orders of the present Vice President, is, petitioner humbly submits, a sufficient proof of the petitioner being in permanent employ.

(c) That at the time of his first appointment in July 1898, petitioner was clearly informed by the then President, that a permanent appointment had been conferred upon him.

(d) That at no time within the five years of the petitioner's service has there arisen any question of the nature of the petitioner's appointment, nor has the petitioner been informed that its tenor was only temporary.

(e) That subsequent to petitioner's entry into service, there were a number of vacancies of Rs15/- and upwards, and petitioner humbly submits that his claims for confirmation should have first been taken into consideration in filling them up, if it was a fact that petitioner's services were only temporary as at present stated

(f) That petitioner too did not represent his claims at the time of these vacancies, as he was fully assured of the permanent nature of his appointment.

(g) That even at the present day, there are in the service, 2 or 3 hands, entertained long after the petitioner joined service and it is a question for consideration as to why the petitioner alone should be chosen for removal as against his juniors in service.

(h) That besides this, there are at the present day one or two vacancies of Overseers, viz., the appointments held by Abdulla Khan and Zynullabdin, (owing to the former's death and the latter's dismissal) and the petitioner might well have been retained, those vacant appointments not being allowed to be filled up. There are also the posts of the Market Sergeant, Distraining Officer, Lighting Inspectors &c.

(i) That the humble petitioner is a poor man, has a large family depending upon him, and is at present put to great hardship, having been suddenly deprived of his bread.

(j) That it is not quite equitable to deprive petitioner of his appointment on the ground that he is a Probationery Overseer (which he is not), and that the Government have directed the reduction of these Probationery Overseers.

9. In these circumstances, the petitioner most humbly and respectfully begs, that his humble representation may be favorably considered and that he may be ordered to be restored to his appointment or provided with any other appointment in the Municipality, for which there are still several vacancies.

For which act of kindness, petitioner will, as in duty bound, ever pray.

He begs to remain
Respected Sir,
your most obedient & humble
servant,
B. K. Thinkaffak

15-8-1903.
Son of Kumfoanna
Bullapan pan
B. Tinky

1st Health Office
Bangalore City
Dt 31st July 1903

No 141 Endorsement

With reference to Conservancy Overseer Thimkappa's application requesting that the notice served on him may be withdrawn as he says that he has put in 5 years service and insured his life, he is informed that as the Government have directed the abolition of 2 Conservancy Overseers



17

No 1

Government, having in their Proceedings No 17287-92 dated the 2nd June 1903, ordered that the services of Probationary Overseers may be dispensed with, notice is hereby given to Overseer, B.K. Thimmappa that his services will not be required in the Conservancy Department - Bangalore City Municipality.

with effect from the 1st proximo

16 L.M.S., D.P.H.,

Health Officer, Bangalore City.

Dr.

To,

B. R. Muniswamy

Sweeper

Thro' the Sanitary Inspector

City Municipality

19

SECTION Revenue
FILE No. 3 Ef 1903
SERIAL No. Rev. 4

Letter No 94 dated the 13th October 1903 from the President of the Municipal Commission Bangalore City reporting on the appeal petition of Thimmakappa Lake Conservancy Overseer of the Municipality.

Submitted to 2nd Councillor for their views
23/11/3

Order thereon No 2031 dated 27-11-03

I have no objection to the issue of this order which has been advocated by the Dewan - I am unwilling to interfere in matters of this kind being of the opinion that this is a hard case —
25-11-03

Government observe that there are no definite charges of misconduct against the petitioner for misconduct and that the very fact that his services were dispensed with owing to the abolition of the Pro tem Lake Conservancy Inspectors' Establishment supports this presumption As will be seen

Govt Pro : No 117 of 09 20

I.T. 276-96

dated the 22 March 1909

the appointment of Pro

bationary Inspectors was

not temporary but the

Petitioner should have been

given a permanent place

when there were vacancies

in the Department as

suggested by the then

President in Remark in

his letter No 176 dated the

10th March 1909. That this

was not done is no fault

of the petitioner, who was

admittedly led into the

impression, as he should

be by his being permitted

to remain for life that

he held a permanent appointment for over 5 years, and on the strength of

it had his life insured

under such circumstances

Government consider that
it is hard to
throw the Petitioner adrift
on the world on such
vague charges of past
misconduct, which
if justifiable should
have been investigated
at the time the alleged
faults were committed,
and the man punished
therefor.

out of employment
now on charges of past
misconduct, which
if justifiable should
have been investigated
at the time the alleged
faults were committed,
and the man punished
therefor.

e President is accordingly
equested to direct the appellant to be
ering retained in
service on some
milar post

21.XI.03

to services by giving him
any of the vacant ap-
pointments or by transf-
ferring any one of the
Overseers and keeping the
petitioner on duty in his
former position. The President
is accordingly requested
to take needful action
in the matter

16/11/03.

The Presdt, Mg Comt, Bangalore

SECTION Mund

FILE No. 135 of 1903

SERIAL No. 5

1904

L 1640 (1)

No. 1642

Name of Petitioner B. K. Shanbhoga, Lecturer, Overseer, Class, municipality, Bangalore

Village Ballapurpet

Taluk Bangalore Taluk

District

Date of Arzi 18/1/04

Date of Receipt 19/1/04

Date of Disposal

No. of Enclosure 2

Transferred to the Local Boards (Municipal) Branch

27/1/04

26-1-04

A. 28/1/04

A. S. Ch

Dy 28/1/04

S. D. Asst

Dy 30/1/04

Reference put up.

2

7/1/04.

Record 2/2

ABSTRACT

Petitioner an appeal against Bangalore Taluk Municipal Commissioner Resolution under No 468 dt 22/25 Dec 03, declining to provide the petr with suitable appointment against Govt order and states that he has injured his life in a fanaghat. which was drawn by him for Rs 1 and that the order of the Vice President offering a temporary appointment of Sweeper was on 7/8/0

MGCPB—4,000—21.1.04

was inspired as he says and
pres: believes; that the petr
has worked well and honestly
for the past twenty years;
that there has been nothing had
against the petr and that if in
the opinion of the Vice President,
the petr is unworthy to hold the
office of a Commissioner Overseer.
some other appointment equal
in salary be given as there
are two or three vacancies in
the municipality -

Prays for the withdrawal of
his salary order and direction
for payment of arrears of pay
due from the date of the petrs
removal upto date of the resultatement
Vice President's No. 852 of 16/12/03
& President's No. 468 of 22/12/03 are
encl'd.

22/1/04



To G.O. 8&5

19/1/14

2 enclosures

1642

H. V. Nanjundayya, Esqr.
Secretary to Govern-
ment of Mysore

Most Respected Sir

The humble memorial of B. K. Thirakappa, Conservancy Overseer, City Municipality, Bangalore, shaweth :—

That on memorialist appealing against the order of the Vice President, directing his re-moval, from the Office of the Con-servancy Overseer, the Government were pleased to direct memorialist's reinstatement on a suitable appoint-ment

That in obedience to the said order of Government, the me-morialist presented himself before the

the Vice President who offered him a temporary appointment of sweeper mestri on Rs 7/8/-

3. That as such an order prejudicially affected Memorialist, both by a reduction in pay to the extent of Rs 7/8/-, and previous services, besides his insurance, he represented his grievance to the President Mr. H. H. Sparkes, who, to his great misfortune, intimated him that as he could not be trusted with a responsible post, he had to be given a lower post on less pay.

4 That the Memorialist is therefore forced once again to appeal to the benign Government, for redress and merciful treatment. The memorialist has for several years past drawn Rs 15/- insured his life on the same pay: and a sudden reduction of half his salary, of a portion of which goes towards the payment of the premium, hardly enables him to maintain his

family

5. The memorialist is a poor man, has all along depended upon Government support, has worked well and honestly during the past several years of his services, there has been nothing bad against him, and to be now thrust as a menial on the unsupported ground of untrustworthiness. is, he ventures to submit, most arbitrary.

6 That memorialist has been without pay for more than a year past, and consequently put to all sorts of miseries & inconveniences, and though it has pleased the Government to direct his reinstatement, it is his misfortune that the authorities concerned should repeatedly neglect him and overrule an order of Government

7 That there are even now two or three vacancies in the Municipality and if, in the opinion of the Vice President, memorialist is untrust-worthy

untrustworthy to hold the post of a Conservancy Overseer, some other appointment equal in salary, may easily be given

In these circumstances, memorialist humbly begs that his case may be kindly considered and that his early restoration to his salary may be graciously ordered and also that the arrears of pay due to him from the date of his removal upto date of reinstatement may be ordered to be disbursed to him.

The memorialist is a man of a large family, and as he is in hard circumstances at present, humbly begs the favour of early orders on the case.

18-1-904

He begs to remain,
most Respected Sir,
your most obedient &
humble servant
B. K. Thirthappah
Son of Kempanna
N. Mapuspet
Bangalore City

28

SECTION Mural

FILE No. 135 of 1903

SERIAL No. 6

Read-

Govt Pro:. no 2031
F.751-02
dated the 30th November
1903 directing that
Shivakabhe, late Con
servancy Overseer in the
Bangalore City Municipality
be retained in service
in some suitable appointment

2. Petition Regd no
642 dated the 18th Jany
1904 from Shivakabhe
complaining against the
Presidents order appointing
him as Conservancy
Inspector on Rs 7-8-0 a
month and praying that
in case he cannot be
awarded to hold his former
of

of a Conservancy Overseer
as considered by the President.
he may be given some
other post carrying a
salary of Rs 157- which he
was formerly getting.

2 drafts

Order thereon No 3015-1897-02 dt 14-2-02

In their order of
the 30th November last
Government directed, after
a consideration of the circumstances of the
case, that the Petitioner
Thirukallan should be
retained in the service
in a suitable post. This amendment
~~Directing of the order~~
that he should be
given an appointment carry-
ing the pay which he
drew when he was allowed by the President to resume his office
was formerly drawing. The

President's order no
1497 dated the 18th Dec^r
1903 received with the
appeal petition shows that
the Petitioner has been
given a pass of Rs 7-8-0
while his former pay was
Rs 15/-4 ~~in the office~~,
~~appointed~~ that the spirit
of the Government order
has not been carried out.
The President is therefore
~~affixed to the order by appointing~~ the
requested to give
Petitioner ~~to an office of the same~~
carrying a salary of Rs 15/-
which he was formerly
drawing.

Devanahalli
12/2/04

Yours
Obediently
Sd/-
12/2/04
Asst/-

To
The Presidt. Taluk Committee,
Bangalore City

SECTION

No. 816 Ex.
L.F. 57-02

FILE No.

SERIAL No. 7

MYSORE DEWAN'S OFFICE,
LOCAL BOARDS BRANCH.

The 16/2/1904

ENDORSEMENT granted to Thimkabha Cole Conservancy Overseer in the Bangalore City Municipality in reply to his Petition Registered No. 1642 dated the 10th January 1904 Complaining against the President's order abolishing his as Conservancy Jamadar on Rs 7-8-0 a month while his former pay was Rs 15/- and praying that in case he cannot be granted to hold the post of a Conservancy Overseer he may be given some other appointment carrying his former salary.

Petitioner is informed that the President has been requested to give him a suitable appointment carrying a salary of Rs 15/- which he was formerly drawing. The enclosures to his petition are herewith returned.

By order

12/2/04

By Order,

Secretary.